

Subject: Re: PROPOSED COUNCIL MOTION - PICO-UNION HPOZ BOUNDARY CORRECTION, CD-1

From: Ken Bernstein <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>

Date: 2/20/18, 12:30 PM

To: Gerald Gubatan <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org>

CC: "Kaufmann-Macias, Terry" <terry.kaufmann-macias@lacity.org>

Thanks, Gerald -- these edits address my comment. One tiny point: in the second paragraph, perhaps change "survey's intent" to "the City Council's intent" since the survey did include the commercial corridors, but the ultimate intent by Planning and the Council was later to exclude these parcels. Otherwise, I think it's good to go.

Ken



Ken Bernstein, AICP, Principal City Planner
Department of City Planning
Office of Historic Resources and
Urban Design Studio
T: (213) 978-1181
200 N. Spring St., Room 601
Los Angeles, CA. 90012

ken.bernstein@lacity.org
preservation.lacity.org
planning.lacity.org
planning.lacity.org/urbandesign

On Tue, Feb 20, 2018 at 10:06 AM, Gerald Gubatan <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org> wrote:

Hello Ken,

Thanks for the feedback on this matter - See attached revised draft - You are more than welcome to offer any further suggested edits for the sake of clarity.

If you have no further objections, we would like to proceed to introduce and refer to PLUM Committee.

Gerald

Gerald G. Gubatan
Senior Planning Deputy
Office of Council Member Gilbert Cedillo
Council District 1

City Hall, Room 460
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tel: [213.473.7001](tel:213.473.7001)
gerald.gubatan@lacity.org
<http://cd1.lacity.org/>

On Fri, Feb 16, 2018 at 9:57 AM, Ken Bernstein <ken.bernstein@lacity.org> wrote:

Gerald,

Thanks for sharing this draft motion with us. Generally, it looks quite good. Our only concern may be that it reads as though the justification for removing this property from the HPOZ is that the building lacks architectural significance and was built outside the Period of Significance, when in actuality, we felt it was justified to be removed to correct an error made during the adoption. The motion could include language to indicate that a review of the HPOZ adoption materials showed that the main commercial corridors were excluded from the HPOZ by intent, with the recommendation that a less restrictive zoning tool to protect those corridors' overall character be considered at a later date. Hope that's helpful.

Ken



Ken Bernstein, AICP, Principal City Planner
Department of City Planning
Office of Historic Resources and
Urban Design Studio
T: (213) 978-1181
[200 N. Spring St., Room 601](http://200.N.Spring.St.,Room.601)
[Los Angeles, CA. 90012](http://Los.Angeles.CA.90012)

ken.bernstein@lacity.org
preservation.lacity.org
planning.lacity.org
planning.lacity.org/urbandesign

On Thu, Feb 15, 2018 at 11:49 AM, Gerald Gubatan <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org> wrote:

Hello Ken, Terry:

I am forwarded a draft Council Motion instucting the Deaprtment of City Planning, in consultation with the City Attorney, to prepare and present an ordinance to remove inclusion of a certain property from the boundaries of the Pico-Union HPOZ.

I am assuming that since the HPOZ was enacted via ordinance, the mechanism to alter the geographical boundaries is to prepare a new ordinance, and thereby repeal the boundaries of the original

Pico Union HPOZ boundaries. I wanted to confirm if this is, in fact, the proper procedural mechanism.

Ken, you may recall discussions with representatives of the property at [1330 West Pico Boulevard](#) as well as Jenna Snow, the historic preservation consultant they retained.

We would like to proceed and introduce the Council Motion, referring it to the PLUM Committee.

If you have any comments or concerns, please advise.

Thanks,

Gerald

Gerald G. Gubatan
Senior Planning Deputy
Office of Council Member Gilbert Cedillo
Council District 1
City Hall, Room 460
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tel: [213.473.7001](tel:213.473.7001)
gerald.gubatan@lacity.org
<http://cd1.lacity.org/>